

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Madden, Daniel J [daniel.j.madden@lmco.com]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2003 6:26 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: FCC - Do Your Job!

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Chairman,

When did you become a lap dog for special interests? Please roll back the ownership to 35% and do your appointed job...to protect society from trashy TV. By the way, you will be held accountable. He is watching.

Sincerely,
One of Your Many Tax-paying Bosses

Stephanie Kost

From: Liz Bradshaw [shawliz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2003 12:57 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Explicit Television

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of

innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that

children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned

about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth G. Bradshaw

RECEIVED

FEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stephanie Kost

From: Kathi Beasley [khbeasley@mchsi.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2003 9:32 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: THIS CHANGE IS WRONG !!

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

I am a retired media professional. As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

Stephanie Kost

From: William D. Wolfe [wwolfe4@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2003 9:07 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Consolidaton of Media Outlet Ownership

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a former broadcaster who functioned under the old 7-7-7 ownership rules, it disturbs me to see the current trend in the consolidation of media outlet ownership...a basic tenant of insuring the use of the broadcast airways for the public interest, convenience and necessity. Bigger is not always better, especially when dealing with a publicly owned commodity like the broadcast airways. The original ownership guidelines were specifically established to ensure that no one voice would be heard over others in the marketplace...that no one group would have undue control over the airways and the content they present. The FCC has violated this sacred trust over the years and it is beginning to catch up with all of us. There is no choice of programming in the radio market, you can hear the same programming on 400 stations at the same time. There is no interest in local market needs...the corporate offices in New York or wherever are applying their standards and likes to small towns as well. Television has become a mass of homogenized stations promoting each other and, in many cases, the newspapers that own them or that are part of the same chair. This is why broadcast programming stinks. There is no competition, there is no local influence, there is no consideration of the public interest, convenience and necessity. I realize that the big media conglomerates have a lot of power, especially during a Republican administration, but they don't know squat about broadcasting. All they know is the bottom line and that is not a service to the nation. I would ask you and the other commissioners to reconsider the urge give any more power and voice to such a limited segment of the total population. We want our voice back. We do not want information and programming to be controlled by a small group of owners. We own the airways and we want them back. Thank you.

Stephanie Kost

From: Turner, Don [dturner@lexingtonchristian.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2003 4:08 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: fcc rules change

RECEIVED

SEP 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same mega corporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those mega corporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by News Corp., the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

Sincerely,

Donnie Turner

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Arthur J Machia [amtv@optonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2003 11:45 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Ownership Rules

DEC 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell,

The people, Congress and the courts have spoken with a sound repudiation of your efforts to change media ownership rules. How sophomoric to think that you could just give away the people's right to diversity of opinions.

Guess we all know just how you got your job, and it wasn't because you know a lick about what freedom of speech or politics is all about.

Best of luck in your new job, wherever nepotism may lead you; because you're not likely to last at the FCC.

Arthur J. Machia, President
American Television Ventures
PO Box 458
Sugar Loaf, NY 10981
Phone: (845) 986-8844
eMail: AMTV@optonline.net

Member:
SMPTE: Society of Motion Picture & Television Engineers
SBE: Society of Broadcast Engineers
ITVA: International Television Association

Stephanie Kost

From: Bill Smith [fmkds@insightbb.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 4:56 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: T V Indecency

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir/Madam,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency

Bill Smith

12/18/2003

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Add 1000's of Emotion Icons to your Emails!

[Click Here](#)



12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Chccchas [chccchas@sinclair.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 9:57 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Children's Issues

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged. Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

Heather Lee

Stephanie Kost

From: Kathleen Wynn [kwynn@ccis.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2003 9:45 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do your job and Stop Raunchy Programming
 Chairman Powell,

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same mega-corporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those mega-corporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The Parents Television Council (PTC) recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community decency standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York and Los Angeles. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to take a stand for decency by voting "yes" to the Dorgan resolution, S. J. Res. 17.

K. Wynn
 380 Cupola Rd.
 Honey Brook, PA 19344

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Bernard Grace [bernard@bgconsultinginc.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 12:37 PM

To: Michael Powell

Subject: Listen to us for the sake of the next generation

Dear Sir,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast air waves over to the same megacorporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those megacorporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The PTC recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations."

Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a handful of major conglomerates. I urge you to do what you can to roll back the ownership cap to 35%, and force the FCC to address the issue of TV indecency.

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Bernard Grace [bernard@bgconsultinginc.com]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2003 8:40 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Public interest

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same mega-corporations that are already filling the prime time schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those mega-corporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The Parents Television Council (PTC) recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community decency standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York and Los Angeles. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to take a stand for decency by voting "yes" to the Dorgan resolution, S. J. Res. 17.

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

From: Chccchas [chccchas@sinclair.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2003 11:48 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Indecency

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr Powell,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same mega-corporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those mega-corporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The Parents Television Council (PTC) recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community decency standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York and Los Angeles. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to take a stand for decency by voting "yes" to the Dorgan resolution, S. J. Res. 17.

Heather Lee
Wright State University
Research Support Tech/SCC Campus
(937) 512-2039

Stephanie Kost

From: Leslie Francis [lfdevinemt@sc.rr.com]

Sent: Monday, September 15, 2003 8:42 AM

To: Michael Powell

RECEIVED

DEC 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Senator,

As you know, in June the FCC changed the rules on station ownership, handing more control of the broadcast airwaves over to the same mega-corporations that are already filling the primetime schedule with explicit, gratuitous sex and graphic, gory violence.

As those mega-corporations buy up even more stations, consumers will have no chance to weigh-in on program content.

Independently owned stations often preempt programming they know to be bad for their communities, but we know for a fact that network owned and operated stations never preempt programming based on community standards.

How do we know this?

The Parents Television Council (PTC) recently surveyed network owned and operated stations across the country. Every one of them told the PTC that they have never preempted programming based on community decency standards.

As further evidence, a Fox affiliated station (owned and operated by NewsCorp, the parent company of Fox broadcasting) recently sent a letter to the PTC that said, "The network, not [the affiliate] decides what shows go on the air for Fox owned and operated television stations." Please take a moment to consider what effect this move will have on program content in the long run: even less accountability to consumers than they demonstrate today.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. -They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York and Los Angeles. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. I urge you to take a stand for decency by voting "yes" to the Dorgan resolution, S. J. Res. 17.

Leslie A. Francis
President
Devine Mortgage
2927 Devine St.

12/18/2003

Columbia, SC 29205

803 256-6501

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: Ron Young [ronyoung@haywood.main.nc.us]

Sent: Monday, October 20, 2003 5:04 PM

To: Commissioner Adelstein

Subject: New regulations

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir, I feel the new regulations approved by the F>C>C> are not in the best interest of the ideals of our democratic system of government. With the failure of the last presidential election for the candidate with the most votes our nation doesn't need any more tampering with our freedoms.

12/18/2003

Stephanie Kost

RECEIVED

From: CHI MARASIGAN [marasigan_chi@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2003 12:00 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

CHI MARASIGAN
2734 SO TROY ST.
ARLINGTON, VA 22206-2913

September 10, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

CHI MARASIGAN

Stephanie Kost

From: Nestor Miranda [nmirand@tracfone.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2003 11:26 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Nestor Miranda
13816 SW 38 Lane
Miami, FL 33175-6491

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 28, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and
NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Nestor

Stephanie Kost

From: Cleo Manuel [cleo@idi.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 10:28 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

Cleo Manuel
218 N. Charles
Baltimore, MD 21201-4021

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Cleo Manuel

Stephanie Kost

From: sherri kay [spyndr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2003 1:49 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: The Government Wants to Change the Way it Collects Funds for the Universal Service Fund

sherri kay
8390 NW 25th St.
miami, FL 33122-1504

October 29, 2003

Federal Communications Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Federal Communications Commissioner Copps:

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

sherri

Stephanie Kost

From: Yvette Davis [yvette@cpucafe.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2003 7:07 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Yvette Davis (yvette@cpucafe.com) writes:

Wednesday, October 15, 2003

To: House Majority Leader Tom DeLay
Speaker Dennis Hastert
Representative Doc Hastings

Re: SJ Res 17

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to you today concerning the FCC Deregulation legislation still sitting in the House without a vote. I urge you today to call for that vote.

I am one of many voices that called, phoned, emailed and faxed the FCC to tell them not to approve further deregulation of the public owned airwaves, and not to approve further deregulation of the newspaper and television markets. I am one of the many voices that was heard by your peers in the Senate who formed a bipartisan committee that took it upon themselves to protect the needs of the people and the needs of our Democracy over the needs of corporations. And I hope that I am one of the many voices calling upon you today to urge you to allow a vote on the resolution of disapproval regarding the FCC's media ownership rule changes.

Thank you,

Yvette Davis
1533 Maple Street
Wenatchee, WA 98801
(509) 667-9367

Reasons I oppose media monopoly:

1. 10 different radio stations playing the same news is worse than no news at all for the American people. 2. Giant non-resident media corporations mean poor local news coverage and could lead to public safety hazards. 3. What passes for news these days is mostly entertainment. Who cares what Brittany Spears wore today? Why should we? Is this the world your parents grew up in? 4. Big media ownership means less open avenues for the voices of democracy. Would women have gotten the vote without a voice? 5. Those who open Pandora's box may find it very hard to close. Take a look at the budget for the Iraq offensive if you don't believe me. Once you give this kind of MONOPOLY power away, it will be very difficult to wrest from the grip of media companies.

CC:
Michael K. Powell
FCC Chairman
Kathleen Q. Abernathy
FCC Commissioner
Michael J. Copps
FCC Commissioner
Kevin J. Martin
FCC Commissioner
Jonathan S. Adelstein
FCC Commissioner
Sen Baucus, Max [MT] - D

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sen Boxer, Barbara [CA] - D
Sen Cantwell, Maria [WA] - D
Sen Collins, Susan M. [ME] - R
Sen Dodd, Christopher J. [CT] – D
Sen Dorgan, Byron L. [ND] - D
Sen Durbin, Richard J. [IL] - D
Sen Edwards, John [NC] - D
Sen Feingold, Russell D. [WI] - D
Sen Hollings, Ernest F. [SC] - D
Sen Hutchison, Kay Bailey [TX] - R
Sen Inouye, Daniel K. [HI] - D
Sen Johnson, Tim [SD] - D
Sen Kerry, John F. [MA] - D
Sen Lautenberg, Frank R. [NJ] - D
Sen Levin, Carl [MI] - D
Sen Lott, Trent [MS] - R
Sen Nelson, Bill [FL] - D
Sen Reed, John F. [RI] - D
Sen Snowe, Olympia J. [ME] - R
Sen Wyden, Ron [OR] - D

RECEIVED

DEC 3 2 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.45.195.174
Remote IP address: 66.45.195.174